Efficient River Management using Stochastic MPC and Ensemble Forecast of Uncertain In-flows

Hasan Arshad Nasir*, Tony Zhao**, Algo Carè***
Quan J. Wang**, Erik Weyer*

*Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, The University of Melbourne, 3010, Victoria, Australia.
(email: {hanasir,ewey}@unimelb.edu.au)
**Department of Infrastructure Engineering, The University of Melbourne, 3010, Victoria, Australia.
(email: {tony.zhao,quan.wang}@unimelb.edu.au)
***Department of Information Engineering, University of Brescia, via Branze, 38 25123 Brescia, Italy.
(email: algo.care@unibs.it)

Abstract: Efficient river management is essential in improving water resource utilisation. However, river flows and water-levels are affected by unregulated in- and out-flows. Therefore, it is important to consider the forecasts of these unregulated flows and the uncertainties in the forecasts. The paper describes control and modelling tools from the literature that suit the river management problem. Specifically, a scenario-based Stochastic Model Predictive Control (MPC) strategy, that makes use of ensemble forecast of unregulated flows, is proposed, where the ensemble forecast contains multiple flow scenarios to characterise future flows and their uncertainties, and are obtained from catchment hydrological models.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Water is a precious resource. Large efforts have gone into achieving efficient water resource management in the last few decades, and many works have appeared on modelling and control of water systems. E.g. (Cantoni et al. (2007); Litrico et al. (2005); Nasir and Muhammad (2011); Weyer (2008); Van Overloop et al. (2005)) have demonstrated improvements in the water distribution efficiency for irrigation channels. Similarly, several works on control and management of rivers are also available, see e.g. (Foo et al. (2012); Litrico (2002); Nasir and Weyer (2016); Young et al. (2007); Nasir et al. (2018); Setz et al. (2008); Corani and Guariso (2005); Pianosi et al. (2012); Turner et al. (2017); Labadie (2004); Castelletti and Soncini-Sessa (2007)).

Rivers play a major role in the timely delivery of water for agricultural, urban and environmental needs. Rivers usually have long time delays because of the long reaches, i.e., locations where flows can be regulated are often far away from locations where the controlled variable is measured, e.g. at the off-take point to an irrigation channel or urban water supply. As a result, forecasts of unregulated in- and out-flows along a reach must be taken into account for efficient management. For the unregulated flow forecasting, hydrological models (Cloke and Pappenberger (2009); Bennett et al. (2016)) are usually required that provide a relationship between the precipitation and the streamflows. However, the flow forecasts are uncertain, and thus a hydrological model that can also quantify the uncertainties in the forecasts is vital in decision making. If the unregulated flow forecasts and the associated uncertainties are not considered in the management process, it can cause flooding or water scarcity. Similarly, evaluating the effects of, e.g., unregulated in-flows to the whole river, especially at the downstream end of a long river, and their variations throughout a season, are essential in river management. Furthermore, timely inundation of wetlands and floodplains to meet environmental requirements is also critical for healthy rivers. For more details on water and river management issues, see e.g. (Soncini-Sessa et al. (2007a,b); Castelletti and Soncini-Sessa (2007); Labadie (2004); Cloke and Pappenberger (2009); Nasir et al. (2018); Acreman et al. (2014)).

The river management objectives must usually be achieved subject to constraints on flows and water-levels. Control strategies such as Stochastic Model Predictive Control (MPC), which in addition to handling the constraints, can also incorporate the unregulated in- and out-flow forecasts and the attached uncertainties, are therefore a natural choice (Nasir (2016); Nasir et al. (2018)). In the Stochastic MPC setting, a Chance-Constrained optimisation Problem
(CCP) (Cannon et al. (2009); Cinquemani et al. (2011); Prumbs and Sung (2009)) is solved in a receding horizon fashion. A CCP is an optimisation problem with probabilistic constraints, which makes the problem non-solvable in general, but the scenario approach (Campi and Garatti (2008, 2011); Calafiore (2010); Carè et al. (2015)) can be employed to find approximate solutions. In the scenario approach, different scenarios of unregulated in- and out-flows, i.e. an ensemble forecast of the flows (Wang and Robertson (2011); Robertson et al. (2013); Zhao et al. (2017a)), are used in the formulation of the scenario problem, and thus it naturally accommodates the unregulated flow forecasts and their associated uncertainties. This paper provides a brief account of the scenario-based river control and the ensemble forecast of the unregulated in-flows, and discusses how the two can be merged.

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 briefly describes a scenario-based control strategy and a modelling tool that provides ensemble forecasts for efficient river management. Section 3 discusses some common river problems where the tools are applicable, and the conclusions are given in Section 4.

2. RELEVANT TOOLS FOR EFFICIENT RIVER MANAGEMENT

In this section we describe the control and modelling tools. First, we formulate a scenario-based optimisation problem whose solution provides suitable control strategies for river management. The control strategy depends on the uncertain ensemble forecasts (scenarios) of the unregulated in-flows from the river, which is discussed in the second part of this section.

2.1 Scenario-based Control & Management of Rivers

River operations such as delivery of water to remote irrigators, water release for environmental purposes, set-point tracking of water-levels or flows along the river etc., depend on in-flows from the unregulated tributaries. Their unreliable streamflow forecasts, coupled with long time delays in the system, pose operational difficulties. Next, we present the components of a Stochastic Model Predictive Control (MPC) (Kouvaritakis and Cannon (2015)) based decision making strategy for river management that has the ability to handle the aforementioned requirements.

River Constraints: As mentioned above, the river constraints can be of different nature, e.g. some relate to the physical capacity of releases from a reservoir, some relate to operations of a hydro-electric power plant, and others are associated with environmental and recreational requirements. However, for a given river stretch between two hydraulic structures, most of these constraints can be translated into constraints on water-levels and the flow releases.

There can be multiple locations in a river stretch where water-levels are constrained and there can be multiple regulated and unregulated in- and out-flows in a given stretch. In this paper, for simplicity, we consider a basic formulation with single water-level to control and single regulated in-flow in the presence of multiple unregulated in- and out-flows, where the regulated in-flow form the decision variables of the control optimisation problem. The formulation, however, can be extended to a general river control problem, for details see (Nasir (2016); Nasir et al. (2018)). For a given river stretch, as described above, we consider the following (probabilistic) chance-constraint on the next water-level, $y_{i+1}$, and the current upstream flow release, $Q_i$, in the presence of unregulated in-flows, $Q_{u,i}$, over the finite time horizon, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, M$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{ y_{i+1}(\bar{y}_i, Q_i, Q_{u,i}) \leq y_{UL} \wedge Q_{LL}(\bar{Q}_{u,i}) \leq Q_{UL} \wedge \Delta Q_{LL} \leq (Q_i - Q_{i-1})(Q_{u,i}) \leq \Delta Q_{UL} \} \geq 1 - \epsilon,$$

where the subscripts LL and UL indicate the lower and upper limits on the water-level, $y$, controlled in-flows, $Q$ and the change in the in-flows, $\Delta Q$, respectively. $y_i = [y_i, y_{i-1}, y_{i-2}, \ldots, y_{i-M}], Q_i = [Q_i, Q_{i-1}, Q_{i-2}, \ldots, Q_{i-M}]$ and $Q_{u,i} = [Q_{u,i}, Q_{u,i-1}, Q_{u,i-2}, \ldots, Q_{u,i-M}]$ are the vectors of past water-levels, and past regulated and unregulated flows, on which the next water-level is dependent. Also, the decision variable, $Q_i$, is a function of $Q_{u,i}$, and hence in the decision making process, we aim to optimise over control policies rather than control values, as it generally leads to handle uncertainties and constraints better, see e.g. (Mayne et al. (2000); Mesbah (2016); Lobberg (2003); Goulart et al. (2006)). The probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ is with respect to the unregulated in-flows, $Q_u$, which is assumed available, and the probability level, $\epsilon$, is user chosen. Also, we assume that the dynamical equations that govern flows and water-levels enforce a convex constraint in the control policy space. This assumption is satisfied by most of the models proposed in the literature of river modelling for control purposes, see e.g. (Foo et al. (2012); Nasir and Weyer (2016); Young et al. (2007)).

River Management Problem: In a Stochastic MPC setting, a Chance-Constrained optimisation Problem (CCP) (Cannon et al. (2009); Cinquemani et al. (2011); Prumbs and Sung (2009)) is solved at every time step. The optimisation problem considers a finite future time horizon in decision making. However, only the decision obtained for the first time step is applied. The objective function considered in the optimisation problem is as follows,

$$J = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=k+1}^{k+M} \alpha_{1,i} (y_i - y_{des})^2 \right. + \left. \sum_{i=k}^{k+M-1} (\alpha_{2,i} (Q_i - Q_{i-1})^2 + \alpha_{3,i} Q_i^2) \right],$$

where $y_{des}$ is a desired water-level, and $\alpha_{1,i}$, $\alpha_{2,i}$ and $\alpha_{3,i}$ are user-chosen weights. Again, the expectation $\mathbb{E}$ is with respect to the unregulated in-flows $Q_u$, on which the water-level, $y$, and the in-flow, $Q$ (via the control policy), are dependent. The objective function has three components, and the control policies, $Q_k, Q_{k+1}, \ldots, Q_{k+M-1}$, will seek to minimise:

- Deviation of water-level, $y$, from a desired level, $y_{des}$.
- Controlled releases, $Q$, to avoid waste of water.
- Change in controlled releases, $\Delta Q$, to avoid abrupt changes.
Together the objective function in (2) and the constraints in (1) define the following CCP,

\[
\min_{Q_k,Q_{k+1},\ldots,Q_{k+M-1}} J
\]

subject to

\[
\{ \text{System dynamics is satisfied} \},
\]

and

\[
\mathbb{P}\{ y_{LL} \leq y_{i+1}(\bar{y}_i, Q_{u,i}) \leq y_{UL} \cap Q_{LL} \leq Q_i(\bar{Q}_{u,i}) \leq Q_{UL} \cap \Delta Q_{LL} \leq (Q_i - Q_{i-1})(\bar{Q}_{u,i}) \leq \Delta Q_{UL} \} \geq 1 - \epsilon, \quad i = k, k+1, \ldots, k + M - 1.
\]

Problem (3) can be solved in a Stochastic MPC setting. However, generally speaking, a CCP is non-convex with respect to the decision policies \((Q_k, Q_{k+1}, \ldots, Q_{k+M-1})\), even if the deterministic constraints are convex. There are randomised strategies available in the literature that can provide computationally tractable approximate solution to CCPs. The scenario approach (Campi and Garatti (2008, 2011); Campi et al. (2009); Calaﬁore (2010); Caré et al. (2015)) is popular because of its simplicity, and it has been applied to river control problems, see e.g. (Nasir (2016); Nasir et al. (2018, 2016)).

Scenario-based River Management Problem: In the scenario approach (Campi and Garatti (2008, 2011); Campi et al. (2009); Calaﬁore (2010); Caré et al. (2015)), we find an approximate solution to a given CCP. We generate \(N_r\) independent realisations of the uncertain variable, e.g. \(N_r\) time series of the unregulated in-flow, \(Q_u\), according to a given probability distribution, and replace the chance constraint in the CCP with \(N_r\) constraints, each having one of the \(N_r\) realisations of the time series. E.g. \(\mathbb{P}\{ y_{LL} \leq y_{i+1}(Q_{u,i}) \leq y_{UL} \} \geq 1 - \epsilon \) will be replaced with \(y_{LL} \leq y_{i+1}(Q_{u,i}) \leq y_{UL}\), for \(j = 1, 2, \ldots, N_r\). The obtained problem is known as the scenario problem, and it is convex, provided the original constraints are convex with respect to the optimisation variables. The scenario problem provides with high confidence a feasible solution to the CCP, provided \(N_r\) is chosen large enough. A sufﬁciently large value of \(N_r\) can be found by using the scenario theorem which states that (Campi and Garatti (2008)): “If \(N_r\) satisﬁes

\[
\sum_{m=0}^{d-1} \binom{N_r}{m} \epsilon^m (1 - \epsilon)^{N_r-m} \leq \beta,
\]

where \(\epsilon \in (0, 1)\) is the allowed violation probability of the chance-constraint, \(\beta \in (0, 1)\) is a user chosen conﬁdence parameter and \(d\) is the number of optimisation variables, then the scenario solution is feasible for the chance-constraint with conﬁdence at least \(1 - \beta\).”

The conﬁdence parameter \(\beta\) can be explained as follows (Campi and Garatti (2008)): It cannot be guaranteed that the scenario solution is always feasible for the CCP in Problem (3), because it might happen that the \(N_r\) extracted realisations are not representative enough. However, if the criterion in (4) is met, then the probability of such an event is less than \(\beta\), and the feasibility of the scenario solution is ensured with conﬁdence \(1 - \beta\). Typically the conﬁdence parameter, \(\beta\), is chosen as a small number, e.g. \(10^{-6}\).

With the application of the scenario approach we replace Problem (3) with the following scenario problem,

\[
\min_{Q_k,Q_{k+1},\ldots,Q_{k+M-1}} J
\]

subject to

\[
\{ \text{System dynamics is satisfied} \},
\]

and

\[
y_{LL} \leq y_{i+1}(\bar{y}_i, \bar{Q}_{u,i}) \leq y_{UL},
\]

\[
Q_{LL} \leq Q_i(\bar{Q}_{u,i}) \leq Q_{UL},
\]

\[
\Delta Q_{LL} \leq (Q_i - Q_{i-1})(\bar{Q}_{u,i}) \leq \Delta Q_{UL},
\]

\[
i = k, k+1, \ldots, k + M - 1,
\]

\[
j = 1, 2, \ldots, N_r.
\]

Problem (S-CCP) is convex with respect to the decision variables and is solvable. The literature provides various modelling techniques which provide ensemble forecasts (scenarios) of the unregulated in-ﬂows from tributaries, see e.g. (Wang and Robertson (2011); Robertson et al. (2013); Bennett et al. (2016)). Therefore, these modelling techniques form a natural fit to the above scenario-based river management problem. In the next sub-section, we brieﬂy describe the background of the ensemble forecast of unregulated in-ﬂows.

2.2 Ensemble Forecast of Unregulated In-ﬂows

In this section we brieﬂy discuss how hydrological models describe unregulated in-ﬂows and provide their ensemble forecasts.

Hydrological Modelling: The unregulated in-ﬂows, \(Q_u\), are usually forecasted using catchment hydrological models (Clore and Pappenberger (2009); Bennett et al. (2016)). A hydrological model accounts for various inﬂuencing factors in the catchment, and it formulates the rainfall-runoff relationship (Duan and Sorooshian (1992)). The relationship is described between precipitation, \(P\), and the in-ﬂows, \(Q_u\), because precipitation is the major determinant of the catchment ﬂows. Moreover, these ﬂows are also affected by the catchment features, such as land use, land cover, soil texture, wetlands, lakes, etc. A hydrological model can be simply conceptualised as (Bennett et al. (2016)),

\[
[Q_{u,k}, Q_{u,k+1}, \ldots, Q_{u,k+M-1}] = H(\ldots, P_{k-2}, P_{k-1}, P_k, P_{k+1}, P_{k+2}, \ldots, P_{k+M-1}).
\]

where \(k\) provides the time index. The antecedent and future precipitations are discussed below.

\(H\), in (6), depends on physical variables and parameters. The physical variables account for the catchment wetness/dryness, including soil moisture and groundwater storage. These variables can be initialised by hydrological simulations, for details see e.g. (Bennett et al. (2016)). The parameters refine the rainfall-runoff relationship, which facilitates the separation of the precipitation into stream-ﬂow, groundwater ﬂow and ﬂow through the soil. These parameters can be calibrated by optimisation routines, for details see e.g. (Duan and Sorooshian (1992)).

In hydro-climatic forecasting, as shown in (6), there are two components of precipitation: 1) antecedent precipi-
Ensemble Forecast and its Attributes: In hydro-climatic forecasting, ensemble forecasts are very useful (Wang and Robertson (2011); Robertson et al. (2013); Zhao et al. (2017a)). The ensemble forecast is generated from a hydrological model and it contains multiple flow scenarios which provides a way to characterise the underlying uncertainty in the flow (i.e. in the unregulated in-flows). The uncertainty originates from the input precipitation, the structure and parameters of the hydrological model. In the forecasting process, the uncertainties from these different sources propagate, for details see (Clark et al. (2008); Vrugt et al. (2009)). Monte Carlo simulations are employed to account for the different kinds of uncertainties and generate the ensemble forecasts (Bennett et al. (2016); Clark et al. (2008)). In particular, Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm is widely used in the literature, e.g. see (Vrugt et al. (2009))

The correspondence between ensemble forecasts and the corresponding observations can be verified by statistical metrics and diagnostic plots (Wang and Robertson (2011); Bennett et al. (2016)). The important attributes of the ensemble forecasts are bias, reliability and skill. These attributes closely relate to the value of the ensemble forecasts in water management. For more details on the attributes of a good forecast, see (Murphy (1993)). The value of ensemble forecasts in reservoir operations has also been investigated in (Turner et al. (2017)).

The ensemble forecast models account for the underlying probability distribution of future flows (Cloke and Pappenberger (2009); Wang and Robertson (2011)), from which one can draw as many scenarios as one requires for analyses, e.g., at the beginning of every month, 1000 streamflow scenarios are generated at the Australian Bureau of Meteorology. This facilitates the scenario-based Stochastic MPC strategy in accommodating a sufficient number of forecasted scenarios, \( N_s \), (see (4)), of the unregulated flows.

3. EXAMPLES OF RIVER MANAGEMENT

In this section, we highlight a few applications that can be targeted with the tools described in the previous section.

3.1 Flood Avoidance

Like several other systems, rivers have normal control operations and some operations related to risk mitigation. The latter operations often include flood avoidance. Here we briefly describe the approach in (Nasir et al. (2018)) to the flood avoidance problem.

The flood avoidance can be accommodated in two ways. First, one can formulate a flood risk related penalty criterion, and append it to the existing objective function of the river management problem, see (2). Second, a suitable constraint related to flooding can be appended to the existing constraints of the river management problem, see (1). The former approach can be conservative with an overemphasis on avoiding risks, even when there are no evident risks. The latter approach, however, keeps an eye on the flood related constraint and signals if there is a possibility of flooding. In such circumstances, the satisfaction of risk mitigation constraints can be prioritised over the normal operations and conservatism is avoided.

In (Nasir et al. (2018, 2016)), the following chance-constraint on the water-level, \( y_t \), was used,

\[
P\{ y_{t+1}(Q_{t}, u_{t+1}) \leq y_{UL} \} \geq 1 - \epsilon_f, \tag{7}
\]

where the subscript FL represents a flood limit. The \( y_{FL} \) is higher than the \( y_{UL} \) in (1), and the crossing of this limit indicates flooding risks. The allowed violation probability \( \epsilon_f \ll \epsilon \), i.e. the satisfaction of the flood avoidance constraint is required with higher probabilistic guarantees compared to the guarantees on the normal operations. With the addition of the constraints in (7) to Problem (3), the river management includes flood avoidance, and it becomes a Multiple Chance-Constrained optimisation Problem (M-CCP) (Schildbach et al. (2013)). Again, there are randomised approaches, available in the literature, that can utilise ensemble forecasts to find approximate solutions to an M-CCP, e.g. see (Zhang et al. (2013); Schildbach et al. (2013)). However, due to the small \( \epsilon_f \) values, the scenario approach (4) requires a large number of scenarios in the ensemble forecast, and thus causes a computational burden. In (Nasir et al. (2018)), the authors proposed a computationally efficient Optimisation, Testing and Improvement algorithm, especially targeted for flood avoidance problems. The algorithm finds an approximate solution to the M-CCP as follows: The solution to Problem (3) is tested against the flood avoidance constraint (7) using new scenarios, and improvements are only made to the solution, if the test fails. This approach reduces the computational burden. For further details, see (Nasir et al. (2018)).

3.2 Long-term River Management

Ensemble forecasts of unregulated in-flows to a river are available on daily, monthly and seasonal time scales, e.g. for short-term management see (Cloke and Pappenberger (2009)) and for long-term management see (Bennett et al. (2016); Wang and Robertson (2011)). In particular, the long-term management provides guidance, e.g. carry-over storage from the current month to the next month, to short-term decision making, e.g. daily releases in the current month, see (Zhao and Zhao (2014)). The long-term management is also necessary for large river basins, as the
transport losses to evaporation are large for such basins, e.g. see (Acreman et al. (2014)). In long-term forecasting, the future precipitation in the hydrological model (see (6)) plays a major role in determining the future flows, and as a result, the uncertainty in the future precipitation dominates the long-term flow forecasts.

With the availability of the tools providing river description and ensemble forecasts of unregulated in-flows, the long-term river management can be based on the scenario-based Stochastic MPC framework in Section 2.1. The objectives and the constraints in Problems (3) & (5) can be modified accordingly. E.g., in the objective function (2), the first term can be replaced with a comparison of a flow, \( Q_i \) (volume per day), at a particular location at the downstream end, with a desired flow \( Q_{des} \) (replacing \( y_i \) with \( Q_i \) and \( y_{des} \) with \( Q_{des} \) in (2)). With that in place, the mathematical description of the flow, \( Q_i \), and its relevant limits must also be added to the constraints in (1).

3.3 Management Related to Environmental Aspects

Environmental aspects of river management is receiving increased attention, see e.g. (MDBA (2014)). The river flow should be kept high enough to ensure a certain amount of spillage to wetlands, flood plains and forests adjacent to rivers. A hindrance to such actions can cause adverse effects on the environment, e.g., without a proper spillage, river forests develop toxic water, which is dangerous to the lives in flowing rivers and ultimately to humans.

To ensure the safety of wetlands, river spillage can be accommodated in both short-term and long-term river managements. The river constraints in (1) can be modified for a specific season, where such spillages are less costly, more likely and safe. Some flow peaks, e.g. from an unregulated river, can be used and/or topped up with additional releases from a reservoir, depending on the requirements of the wetland. The technical challenge here is to forecast the timing and amplitude of such flow peaks with good accuracy to match it with the releases from a reservoir. A specific models for high flow range can also be used for such tasks. Furthermore, models for overbank flow can be sought too (Zhao et al. (2017b)). With such models and constraints in place, the scenario-based river management (Problems (3) & (5)) can conveniently accommodate and address the issues related to environmental aspects.

4. CONCLUSIONS

To ensure efficient river management, forecasts of unregulated flows, along with their uncertainties, should be incorporated in the management process. This paper proposed a way to combine tools that provide ensemble forecast (scenarios) of unregulated flows with the Stochastic MPC based control strategy that can accommodate those scenarios in the control and management process. The paper also discussed a few river problems, where such a procedure is applicable.
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